UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
3 1761 01478388 0

LaE.Gr
P9623

The problem of grammar.

THE ENGLISH ASSOCIATION

Pamphlet No. 56

LIBRARY
MAR 12 1935
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

The Problem of Grammar

July, 1923

THE PROBLEM OF GRAMMAR

INTRODUCTION

THE Departmental Committee on the Teaching of English devoted certain pages of their Report to 'The Problem of Grammar', and the present pamphlet, which has adopted the same title, will be found to be in some measure a development and discussion of those pages. The findings in this section of the English Report have, apparently, excited considerable discussion and some disappointment among teachers. The discussion was to be expected; a pronouncement upon the vexed question of grammar would have attracted attention in any event. The disappointment was also not surprising; it was, no doubt, hoped that the Committee would do something to 'settle the question'; instead, they seemed to raise new issues and so, in the eyes of the harassed teacher, to render confusion worse confounded. In point of fact the Committee made no effort to decide the question out of hand, and, if their diagnosis of the present situation be sound, such an effort would have been futile had they made it. What they tried to do was to get down to first principles, and to clear the air of certain fallacies which had darkened counsel in the past. Thus, after remarking upon the conflicting nature of the evidence submitted to them, they wrote: 'When a subject is thus hotly debated, and when it is difficult to discover a general consensus of opinion among practitioners upon any aspect of the matter, it is legitimate to suspect that the problem has hitherto not been sufficiently analysed or envisaged, and that the confusion of tongues arises from confusion of thought. Under such circumstances, we believe that the most useful thing we can do in this Report is to make some attempt to set the problem in its proper proportions.' If then we take the Committee at their word, we must attach importance not so much to the actual recommendations which they make upon the teaching of grammar as to the way in which they regard the problem as a whole. From this point of view the considerations which appear to have weighed most with them are:—

(i) that English grammar, as taught in school, has hitherto been modelled far too closely on the lines of Latin grammar; in other words, that a grammatical system based upon the structure of a dead synthetic language is ill-adapted to the needs of a living language which is largely analytical in character.

(ii) that modern English, having been neglected by philologists until quite recently, the laws of its structure are only now being worked

out, and English grammar is, therefore, a difficult, not to say a dangerous, subject to handle in the class-room.

(iii) that, nevertheless, some introduction to the study of language is necessary in most schools, and that for this purpose 'pure or functional grammar' rather than modern English grammar is the proper instrument.

To the practical teacher, perhaps, these theses, however interesting, do not seem particularly helpful. They cast down his old gods and set up in their stead an unknown deity called 'pure grammar', the nature of which the English Report makes little attempt to explain. Evidently the Committee's main purpose was to provoke discussion, and to guide discussion on to what they considered right lines. They felt that it was as yet too early to prescribe for the class-room.

It seemed to the Executive Committee of the English Association that here was a situation in which something useful might be done. If discussion was the need, the English Association existed to promote discussion upon matters of moment to teachers of English. If, as the English Report declared, linguistic students were discovering new facts about the English language, some representative philologist might be invited to inform the Association what the position was at the present time. If 'pure grammar' was the road to grammatical salvation in the schools, it was highly desirable to make quite sure what the expression 'pure grammar' implied. Accordingly the first annual conference after the publication of the English Report was devoted to 'The Problem of Grammar'. At this conference, which was held at Bedford College, 27th May 1922, the Association was fortunate in securing, as the principal speakers, Professor Allen Mawer of Liverpool University, one of the most distinguished of living English linguistic scholars, and Mr. S. O. Andrew, head-master of the Whitgift Grammar School and member of the Prime Minister's Committee on the teaching of the Classics, who had long been known to entertain views on the subject of 'pure grammar'. Their papers, together with an account, necessarily highly condensed, of the interesting discussion that followed, form the substance of the present pamphlet.

But before proceeding to report the conference itself, it is necessary to speak of two events which have taken place in the interim. One is the publication, in vol. viii of *Essays and Studies* of a paper entitled 'English Grammar and Grammars' by Dr. R. B. McKerrow. As this valuable contribution to the controversy is available to all members of the Association, and must be familiar to most of those who will read this pamphlet, it is needless to say more about it here.

The other event, or rather series of events, requires more detailed treatment.

In the course of their recommendations on grammar the English Committee declared 'that the terminology used should be that recommended in the Report of the Joint Committee on Grammatical Terminology'. The purpose of this recommendation is obvious. The Departmental Committee, believing as they did that 'the sole justification for teaching grammar in school is that it forms the necessary introduction to the study of language', naturally suggested that the grammatical terminology used in school should be that 'common to the grammar of all languages'. Where they erred, according to some of their critics (among them Professor Mawer), was in assuming that the terminology set forth in the Report of the Joint Committee would answer the needs they had in view, and in overlooking the fact that this Report, drawn up as long ago as 1911, took no cognizance of recent developments in English philology and tended, to use Professor Mawer's words, to tie down English grammatical teaching more tightly than ever just when it most needed freedom to strike out on new paths for itself. These words were spoken at the conference on 27th May 1922, and Professor Sonnenschein, the chairman of the Joint Committee, who was present, made a vigorous protest, as we shall see later. The point to be noted here is that the English Association had itself been represented on Professor Sonnenschein's Committee, and these representatives had appended their signatures to the Report of 1911, although with reservations. Shortly after the conference of 1922, the Executive Committee of the English Association received a request to pledge the Association's support once more to the Report on Grammatical Terminology. The matter came up at a thinly attended meeting, and since few, if any, of those present had followed the conference in May or were aware of the issues involved in the request, it was naturally assumed that a document to which the Association had put its hand in 1911 still merited the Association's support. The request was formally granted, and a few days later Professor Sonnenschein was able to claim in a letter printed in the public press that all the associations (among them of course the English Association) which had originally subscribed to the Report on Grammatical Terminology had reaffirmed their faith. The publication of this letter created something approaching consternation in certain quarters of the Association; the matter was brought up again at the next meeting of the Executive Committee; and in the end a sub-committee was appointed to consider what ought to be the Association's present attitude towards the question of grammatical

terminology. Representatives of both schools of grammatical thought found a place on this sub-committee, which after a number of meetings and considerable discussion drew up an agreed document. This document, in the somewhat abridged form in which it was finally adopted by the Executive Committee, runs as follows:—

A note by the English Association upon 'The Report of the Joint Committee on Grammatical Terminology (1911)'.

The English Association has on a former occasion expressed its sympathy with the attempt of the Joint Committee on Grammatical Terminology to secure consistency in the use of grammatical terms in English schools. But it recognizes that the researches of philologists during recent years have emphasized certain characteristics of English which distinguish it from the other languages dealt with in the Joint Committee's Report, and that, in particular, difficulties have arisen with regard to the notions of case, mood, modality, time and tense. It desires, therefore, to explain that its assent to the recommendations of the Report has been given with reservations, and to express its belief that teachers who keep abreast of modern linguistic and grammatical research will be careful not to prejudice investigation by using in their English lessons any term borrowed from the conditions of other languages unless it can be justified by the occurrence of similar conditions in our own. They may well ease the burden of those pupils who will shortly begin the study of other languages by anticipating, in the way of special treatment, the related grammatical conceptions of those languages. But it is one thing to make use in teaching grammar of the numerous points of actual resemblance between English and the four foreign languages dealt with in the Report: it is quite another to invent resemblances which have in fact no existence. It has been thought desirable to make this explanation of the Association's attitude. But it is to be noted that a considerable portion of the pamphlet, in particular those sections which deal with the logical basis of language, is, speaking generally, not open to question.

The foregoing 'note' represents a compromise, of course, and compromise is seldom an occasion for enthusiasm with either of the interested parties. It was, however, a source of much satisfaction, to the chairman of the sub-committee if to no one else, to find that an agreed statement of some kind was possible. The deliberations of the sub-committee were most amicable; yet the production of this short paragraph, almost every sentence of which was a battle-field, has delayed the publication of the present pamphlet for a twelvemonth.

J. D. W.

THE PROBLEM OF GRAMMAR IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN LINGUISTIC THOUGHT

By Professor Allen Mawer

In the recent report of the English Committee one of the most refreshing features was the frank recognition there given to the great changes which are even now taking place in our grammatical conceptions as the result of the study of modern languages, and more especially of English, by many distinguished scholars, of whom Jespersen is the most prominent.

As a basis for to-day's discussion upon Grammar I should like to develop, a little more fully than the limits of the Report allowed, some of the lines upon which those changes have taken place, and there is the more reason for so doing as unfortunately only too little is known of the matter in England, largely because from the linguistic point of view the material is somewhat inaccessible.

The root of the whole matter lies undoubtedly in the realization by modern students of language of the vast and essential differences of grammatical structure between the languages of Modern Europe on the one hand and those of the Ancient World on the other. The process of passage from highly inflected to less inflected or uninflected forms of speech has necessitated the development of entirely new methods of expressing the relation of words and ideas to one another, and, let me hasten to add, has not been merely a process of simplification, and certainly has not been one of corruption or degeneration. The analytic structure of many modern languages has given opportunities for expressing in language shades of thought, feeling, and idea which are not found or only imperfectly expressed in synthetic languages of more rigid structure. The process is, moreover, not by any means confined to English. She may have carried it furthest, with Danish as a good second, but German is advancing in the same direction and no European language is unaffected by it.

As a necessary corollary to this change of structure comes a shifting of the emphasis in grammatical study. Morphology and accidence play less and less part in grammars of modern speech, while syntax is becoming all important. It is symptomatic of the new trend of thought in this matter that when Jespersen had completed the section on Phonology in his *Grammar of Modern English* he proceeded immediately to tackle the problems of syntax.

Further, let us note that when we pass from the study of a dead

language to a living one there is bound to be a slight change in our conception of the function of grammar. The grammar of a language whose canon is, so to speak, complete, must tend to be a statement of rules, a scheme of government, for it is based upon usages which cannot in the nature of things be capable of change. The grammar of a living language must, on the other hand, be a 'live' if ordered record of language as we hear it read and spoken every day. Such language cannot in the very nature of things remain entirely fixed and unchanged, and the function of grammar must in this case be to recognize rather than retard the inevitable processes of linguistic development.

So much for the general ideas underlying modern conceptions of grammar, let us now illustrate in some detail a few of the points in which the new method of approach has disturbed long-accepted grammatical traditions.

Let us look first at one of the fundamental distinctions of grammar, viz. the grouping of the parts of speech, and let us take in particular the common definitions of noun and adjective. 'A noun is the name of a person or thing.' 'An adjective is a word that is used with a noun, to describe or indicate or enumerate what is denoted by the noun.' These definitions are not very helpful when in French we are called upon to distinguish noun and adjective in such expressions as *un philosophe grec*, *un savant aveugle*, or to decide whether in *un peuple ami*, or *une nation amie* we have two nouns or an adjective and a noun. The distinction is clearer in English and German partly through the fixed position of the adjective, partly because in German noun and adjective are in part at least inflected differently and partly because, as in English, the adjective ceased to be inflected while the noun remained so. When Shakespeare speaks of 'Normans, but bastard Normans, Norman bastards', it is not so much our definition of noun and adjective as the accidental difference of inflexion which enables us to determine which is which.

The real distinction between noun and adjective is clear when we observe with Jespersen in his *Sprogets Logik* that the noun always denotes something more specialized than the adjective, e. g. Napoleon the third, a new book, the sad history, a beautiful afternoon, a blue stone. Between the most highly specialized type of noun, viz. proper nouns and the most general type of adjective, viz. the article, there are of course an infinite number of degrees of specialization. Note here that this definition is not invalidated by the existence of such forms of expression as 'Bradford woollens', for 'Bradford' here means 'manufactured in Bradford' and can be applied to many other things

besides woollens. Note too how it solves the problem as to which is noun and which is adjective in *les philosophes grecs*—for philosophers are unfortunately much less common than Greeks, so the specialized *philosophes* is a noun, while the more common *grecs* is an adjective. Such a phrase as *les grecs philosophes* or *denkende Griechen* in place of the familiar *griechische Denker* is unnatural, because it presupposes that there are more thinkers than there are Greeks.

In further illustration, note Galsworthy's 'After having been a Conservative Liberal it was first in Disraeli's time that he became a Liberal Conservative'. Conservative and Liberal as descriptive of types of mind are of much wider application than the actual name of the parties, hence the distinction of noun and adjective in the two phrases. Or, secondly, the way in which the use of an adjective as a noun may make a phrase much more pointed than when the adjective is used as such. *Vous êtes un impertinent* is much more effective than *Vous êtes impertinent*; on the other hand, when a noun is used as an adjective the adjective is as a rule of much wider application than the noun, as in the French nouns *rose*, *mauve*, *puce*, when used as adjectives of colour. Finally, it is this different degree of specialization which accounts for the fact that adjectives can be compared while nouns cannot.

Closely allied to this fresh analysis of the function of noun and adjective is Jespersen's ranging of words in a sentence according to their rank as Primary, Secondary, or Tertiary, or better as principal, adjunct, and subjunct. One word (the primary or principal) is defined or modified by a second (the secondary or adjunct), and that again by a third (the tertiary or subjunct).

There may be further sub-modifications for words of quaternary or quinary rank, but we need not specify them by any particular name as no language has developed any particular form to express them. Thus in 'Extraordinary warm weather', *weather* is principal, *warm* is adjunct, and *extraordinary* is subjunct. In 'A certainly not very well-established conjecture', though *certainly* is a quinary or even a sexenary word, it does not differ from a tertiary in form.

The function of the adjunct is to specialize, to particularize the principal; of the subjunct to do the same thing for the adjunct: and note here that this is not a contradiction of, or inconsistent with, what was said above about the noun being more specialized than the adjective, for the word or phrase which is to be specialized by the help of another word is always more special than the specializing word. Note the increasing series of specializations in *very*, *poor*, *very poor*, *widow*, *poor widow*, *very poor widow*. Note specially the

function of *the*, the most general and least specialized of all adjuncts in 'Give me *the* book'.

There is, of course, some degree of correspondence between these orders of subordination and the three parts of speech, noun, adjective, and adverb; we might even define nouns as words habitually standing as principals, &c., but the correspondence is not complete. The distinction between principal, adjunct, and subjunct is a logical one and applies to all languages; that between noun, adjective, and adverb is a grammatical one and can only easily be maintained where the classes are kept apart by inflexions. It breaks down in a language like Finnish where there is no distinction of form between noun and adjective, where you still do only have 'nouns' in the old sense. In English, as we saw above, inflexion has done something to keep them apart, but note that *poor* in '*poor* people' is identical in form with *poor* in 'the poor', though it is adjunct in one case and principal in the other, and *butcher's* in 'the *butcher's* shop' is a noun in form but an adjunct in function. The formal difference between adjectives and adverbs in English is very slight and from the point of view of the old categories we may dispute endlessly as to whether *then* in 'the *then* government' and *here* in 'this man *here*' is adjective or adverb, but from the new point of view it is clear that *then* and *here* are both alike adjuncts rather than subjuncts. The distinction between different parts of speech depends on formal criteria. As languages develop, those formal criteria are often obliterated, and it would seem well that we should have some less ambiguous and artificial grouping of our words.

Jespersen shows how misleading is some of the current grammatical terminology when he refers to the N.E.D. treatment of *there* (sense 1), It is called a substantive not only in 'There is no "here" nor "there"', where it is a quotation substantive, and 'Motion requires a here and there', where it has become a real substantive, as also in 'In the space-field lie innumerable other theres', but it is also called a substantive in 'over against there', 'from there', and 'he left there last night', in which cases *there* retains its proper adverbial force and signification though used as a principal (obj. of a prep. or a verb). If we call *there* a noun, to be consistent we should have to call '*behind the old oak*' in 'from behind the old oak' a substantive, and '*between 2 and 3,000*' in 'he left between 2 and 3,000' a substantive also. Really they are group-principals. In parts of speech the part of speech must follow the use—they are not merely 'used as' such.

Another field of grammar in which we are realizing the need for new categories, new grouping of ideas is that of time and tense. In his paper *Tid og Tempus*, published in 1914, Jespersen shows how

many and great misunderstandings have arisen from our failure to distinguish the real category of *tid* or time from the grammatical category of *tempus* or *tense*. Fundamental confusion has arisen in the matter from the unfortunate fact that in certain languages, and English is one of them, the terms 'present', 'past', and 'future' have come to be used of two entirely different things—time and tense. The truth is that a form which is present in 'tense' may be used of present, past, or future in 'time'. 'I travel' in 'I travel to Moscow' may in narrative refer to past times. In 'I travel to-day' it refers to present time, and in 'I travel to-morrow' refers to future time, and yet in all these we have only one tense, viz. the present, and our grammatical thought will remain confused until this is recognized in our grammatical nomenclature, and perhaps the best thing would be to keep the terms, present, past, and future for use of 'time' only, and to use *praesens*, *praeteritum*, and *futurum*, or some such terms for 'tense'.

The *praesens* tense is not limited to expressing what is present in time, that which is happening at the present moment; it is also used of what is true at all times, e.g. 'the earth turns on its axis', of the future as in 'I travel to-morrow', and that which is past in time as in the historic present. And here let us note that the last usage is by no means a purely literary idiom, you can hear it every day in the streets in that characteristic Englishman's, or still better, Englishwoman's 'I says to him', an idiom which led to the Chinese nickname for an English Tommy, 'Sez I'.

The future in time has in some languages a distinctive *futurum* tense or series of tenses, but in English, while we can express the future in many ways, not one of them is really a future in tense. Note the alternatives, (1) I *shall* sail, (2) he *will* sail, (3) I am *going to* sail, (4) we hope we *may sail*, (5) I wish that you may *come to be* ashamed. Not one of them is future in form.

Tense forms can on the other hand be used to express ideas that have nothing to do with the time with which they were once associated. In 'Would he were here!' the *praeteritum* expresses a wish for the present. Similarly in 'If I were rich, I would pay you' we use the forms of the *praeteritum*, but in time the sentence refers only to the present. The *antepraeteritum* form also can be used of the present time. 'If I had had the money I would have paid you.' A *praeteritum* form can be even used of the future time. 'It is high time he was punished.' In 'Could'nt you lend' or 'Could'nt you have lent me sixpence?' the *praeteritum* tense-form is used but the reference in time is to the present.

When we pass from *praesens*, *praeteritum*, and *futurum* to *perfectum* we still see the necessity of distinguishing form from meaning. The old process whereby perfects became presents is still going on, and in 'I've got no time to do it' and 'You've got to do it' perfect tense forms are used to express pure presents in time.

Note also the necessity of recognizing that the perfect tense can refer to both present and past time in English in the case of the passive, according as the emphasis so to speak is on the auxiliary or on the participle. There is all the difference in the world between the time of *are paid* in 'His bills *are paid* regularly on the first of every month' and 'His bills *are paid*, so he owes nothing now', and there is a very definite difference of meaning between *was shut* in the two halves of the following sentence—'When I came at five the door *was shut*, but I do not know when it *was shut*'—one is present in time and the other past, though both have the same tense-form.

If we are not to involve ourselves in hopeless contradictions and difficulties we need to think out afresh for ourselves the whole system whereby, though the actual tense forms of a modern language are fewer than those of the ancient ones, the methods of expressing time have been greatly multiplied and varied and new connotations of time given to the old tense forms.

And so we might go on; enough has been said I think, however, to show that it is no exaggeration to say that our ideas of grammar are being revolutionized. I have laid chief stress upon the work of Jespersen because his exposition is the fullest and most recent; but remember that he does not stand alone and that he had an honoured and great predecessor in Sweet in his *New English Grammar* and in such a paper as that of his on *Words, Logic, and Grammar*. We have got to face the task of reconstructing our grammar because owing to the transformation which modern languages have undergone on the formal side, our grammatical categories no longer in any way correspond with the permanent logical categories, and now that formal distinctions are fast disappearing logical considerations are fast becoming all important in the analysis of our speech.

What, you may say, is the bearing of all this on the problem of grammar? To me it seems quite clear, viz. that until these new problems have been worked out fully, new terms and definitions established which really fit the facts of the case, we must, as far as possible, hold our hands with regard to the teaching of grammar, and in so far as we do teach it, confine ourselves to the simplest and most elementary phases of it, above all let us not create confusion worse confounded by trying in yet more rigid fashion than we have done in

the past to tie up the teaching of the grammar of a modern language and land ourselves in all kinds of inconsistencies by forcing it into the frameworks of other languages, however excellent those frameworks may be in themselves when used for those particular tongues.

This is the conclusion to which on the whole the authors of the English Report would seem to have come when they advocated the teaching of Pure Grammar and the abandonment for the time being of the difficult problem of English Grammar. So far as they intend under the head of Pure Grammar to suggest that grammatical teaching should occupy itself mainly with the simple logical basis of speech which is common to all languages I am in agreement with them. But I hope that this Pure Grammar will occupy itself, to use the Report's own phrase, with 'the structure of our thought' rather than the forms of the words, and that when it deals with what the Report calls our 'time-honoured parts of speech' it will not be unmindful of the fact that, so far as they rest upon distinctions of form now often vanished, there is room even here for some reconsideration of things. I feel it is the more important to raise these *caveats* because, by what seems to me a most unfortunate *non-sequitur*, the Report advocates as part of the scheme of 'Pure' grammatical reform the adoption of the nomenclature of the Committee on Grammatical Terminology! Now we owe a great debt to that committee for its long and unselfish labours, we must welcome much of its work and many of its conclusions, but it does seem to me to fail almost entirely to recognize all these new and important aspects of grammar to which the English Report itself pays tribute, and to try to tie down English grammatical teaching more tightly than ever just when it most needs freedom to strike out on new paths for itself.

May I illustrate my point, and first with reference to *case*. Grammar based on the Terminology Report would commit us to the view that English has five cases. It tries to make the best of both worlds by saying on the one hand, through the words of its chairman, that case is a category of meaning and not of form (Sonnenschein, *English Grammar*, Part II, p. 4) and that therefore there is no difficulty in speaking of cases in an uninflected language, but on the other hand we are told (Report, p. 25) that the term 'case' is necessary for English grammar by itself, in view of the surviving inflexions, especially in pronouns. Now, if case is a category of meaning rather than of form, there is no reason whatever why we should stop at five cases, we ought at least to have locatives and instrumentals, and it is surely a little hard that the ablative should be given the cold shoulder. Further, if case is purely a question of meaning and not of form there

is no reason why *him* in 'I gave *him* the book' should be dative, whereas in 'I gave the book to Peter', 'to Peter' is described as a case-phrase in which *Peter* is accusative after *to*. A case-phrase is presumably a phrase which is the equivalent of a case, and what can the case be here but the dative? If, however, we defend cases on the ground of form there is no need in English at all for a vocative, or for any distinction between accusative and dative, even in pronouns. As a last resort the distinction has been defended on yet a third ground, viz. that of position. It is suggested that there must be a difference between dative and accusative because the dative even in nouns always precedes the accusative, as in 'I gave my son a present' and 'It saved my father much trouble', but what of 'I brought it him yesterday'. Surely all the essential ideas of English case-relation are expressed by the three cases—nominative, possessive (which is really much more applicable to English speech-usage than the proposed term genitive) and objective, or still better, dependent case.

Next, with reference to the parts of speech, it seems to me illogical on the part of those who are so anxious about the preservation of cases to suggest that if I say *God's Book*, 'God's' is the genitive case of a noun but if I say '*its* contents', *its* is not the genitive case of a pronoun but is an adjective, the only ground for this distinction being that in Latin and French a distinctive adjectival form has developed. The distinction cannot be defended on the ground that even in English we differentiate between such forms as *my* and *mine* as adjective and pronoun, for the differentiation here is due to entirely different causes. *Mine* in the epithet position naturally lost its *n* before nouns beginning with a consonant and the *my* form soon became universal, or almost so, in this position. There was no reason why *mine* in the predicative position should suffer such a loss and so the distinction between *my* and *mine* is not due to syntactic causes at all.

The case of the verb and its tenses has led to such strange anomalies as talking of 'lest he should write' in 'I fear lest he should write' as a subjunctive equivalent, or of 'I should be glad' in 'If he came I should be glad' as a past subjunctive which has come to express not futurity from a past point of view but remoteness of expectation at the time of speaking. Surely we might cut the Gordian knot of all this complication of phraseology entailed in trying to find English equivalents for every tense form in Latin, or vice versa, without any regard to the real time expressed, and say that in 'If I knew his address I should write to him' we refer to present time and not to future or past at all (whatever the tense forms may

be) the meaning being simply 'my ignorance of his address prevents me now from writing'.

Or to take a more simple case, it is true that 'I think' is the present tense of 'think' and implies present time, but it is not true that 'I eat' is the present of 'eat' in time whatever it may be in tense. In time 'I am eating' is more truly the present of 'eat'. Unfortunately there is no room for the expression of such fundamental distinctions in a scheme of grammatical terminology which has to attempt the impossible task of fitting not one but at least five widely differing languages.

Finally, let us realize that English is becoming a world language which is being taught in the schools of well nigh every civilized nation. Are we going to handicap the attainment of that ideal by tying English down to a system of grammar, which does not recognize to the full the fundamental facts of its structure. May I quote here the words of a distinguished English scholar who was at one time teaching English in Japan. He says 'Since the time when I taught English in Japan I have had very strong views on the absurdity of trying to force on English a grammar and a grammatical terminology which belong to classical languages. When one tries to teach a non-Aryan one quickly finds that the rules and explanations of the ordinary English grammar simply don't work, and one has to invent for oneself an entirely different method of approaching the subject based on the real meaning and implication of the forms. Translation from Japanese into English or vice versa is of course not a question of finding equivalents for words but of finding what is really meant or implied by the phrase in our language and finding in the other something that corresponds to it. Hence much difficulty especially with the English verbs, as, if approached by the ordinary methods of English grammar, there seems to be nothing corresponding to the "moods" and "tenses" in Japanese. I found it, however, quite possible, if one really considered what the verbal forms now meant instead of how they were originally formed, to devise a grammar of the verb which was easily understood and exceedingly helpful to my students. One really wants a new terminology altogether which is free from incorrect implication'.

On that note I am well content to conclude.

Note.—In the interval since this paper was written, Monsieur Brunot's great book *La Pensée et la Langue* has appeared and made yet more clear the necessity for reconsidering our grammatical conceptions, especially in relation to Modern Languages.

THE TEACHING OF GRAMMAR

By Mr. S. O. Andrew.

There are two questions which we have to ask ourselves:

(i) What kind of grammar, if any, should we teach to children?

(ii) Why should we teach it?

It will be convenient, because it will lead us to the heart of our problem, if I begin by discussing very briefly two answers to the second question, Why do we teach grammar?

First Answer: In order to inculcate the habit of correct speech.

The obvious objection to this is that as a matter of fact nobody has ever learnt to speak correctly by the study of grammar. In this there is nothing astonishing: correct speech is an art, and the only way to acquire it is to practise it constantly, like any other art, until it becomes a habit. It may be said in fact that a child is not fit to begin grammar until it has first learned to speak more or less correctly. Grammar on the other hand is a Science, which finds its material in the usages of correct speech. This first answer, therefore, is wrong because it puts the science before the art.

Second Answer: In order to prepare the ground for Latin or some other foreign language.

Now, whatever may justly have been said in favour of this view of grammar from the standpoint of the mediaeval Grammar School, it is wholly out of date when applied to conditions of universal vernacular education such as we have to-day. Is it not, in fact, this legacy from the old classical school which is the source of all our troubles, and which has brought the modern teaching of grammar into such contempt? It is a heritage which has saddled us, at least until the other day, with a collection of categories and terms many of which are meaningless in English grammar, and with incredible stupidities like the exercise of parsing uninflected words. Ulterior motives are always a danger to honest teaching; in this case, they have given rise to a pretentious sham education which has been wittily hit off by our most candid modern critic in the saying that 'the English way of learning a thing is to study something else'.

We are brought back therefore to our original questions: What kind of grammar should children learn? and why should they learn it?

I am going to suggest that children should begin not with the grammar of any particular language, but with universal, or as I prefer to call it, Pure Grammar.

In making quite clear what I mean, I must ask your indulgence if I travel over some very familiar ground: which I will do as rapidly as possible. There are certain principles or laws common to all language as such, because based on the analysis of thought. The science dealing with these principles is Pure Grammar.

In the simplest sentence we have

	Subject	+	*Predicate*
i. e., speaking grammatically	Noun or Pronoun	and	Verb.

Next, these fundamental or 'substantive' parts of speech may have certain qualifying words attached to them, viz. the adjective or the adverb. We have thus five primary parts of speech, easily derived from these five obvious functions in the sentence:—noun, pronoun, adjective, verb, adverb. Let us note that so far we are not regarding the form of words but their function only; a particular word is not always the same part of speech, and in order to decide which part of speech, we must look at it in its context. A word which is normally a noun may in its particular context be an adjective, and vice versa; some words (e. g. 'round') may be many parts of speech, and it is no concern of Pure Grammar which function is the original one, and which the derived. That is a matter for Historical Grammar entirely.

We have just spoken of the form of words; and it will be well at this point to dwell for a moment on the fact that the relation of any word to its fellow words in a sentence, i. e. its function in that particular context, may be shown in English in several ways:

i. By form or inflexion.
ii. By order.
iii. By phrase.

If we say 'He gripp'd me and him gripp'd I', the sense is clear because the form of the pronouns 'I' and 'him' shows that in both parts of the sentence 'I' is subject and 'him' object; but we could not substitute uninflected words like 'Jim' and 'Jack' for the pronouns in the same order, because when we use these words as subject and object, it is the order that determines which is which.

What I wish to draw attention to at this moment, however, is the third way of indicating function: viz. the use of the phrase, because it introduces us to a new part of speech, the preposition. We say indifferently 'the king's crown' or 'the crown of the king' (using the preposition), and in both instances 'king's' and 'of the king' are adjectival in function. Now most definitions of the preposition, so far as my experience goes, are very puzzling to children, and I would

suggest that for them its definition should be 'the little word which introduces an adjective phrase' (or 'an adverb phrase' as the case may be). Children are sometimes told, apparently, that the little words called prepositions can be identified by the fact that they precede a noun. There are, as we all know, no fool-proof rules: I examined recently a number of small boys who had been taught this particular rule, and they said that in the sentence 'Write down the words' 'down' was a preposition because it came in front of 'words'. The only safe rule is for the boy to use his common sense and ask himself whether 'down' in the particular context helps to make an adjective or adverb phrase. Incidentally, the example I have given shows the importance of oral work and of making children *think* of a sentence as they would naturally *speak* it. No child would group together 'down the words' in speech.

Again, the work of a noun, adjective, or adverb may also be performed by a clause; an analysis of the clause yields us the conjunctive parts of speech, viz. the relative pronoun, a special kind of a part of speech already known, and the conjunction, an entirely new part of speech, our seventh and last.

This is the end of our course or at least of the main part of it. We can now go on to our second question, and ask what will the learner gain from it? I should reply, primarily, he will gain what he gains from the study of any other science, a knowledge that the manifold of his experience can be reduced to order, that it can be classified and generalized. He will see that language, the expression of thought, is a *structure* with definite parts which have definite functions, and that these functions can be classified under a quite limited number of categories, and named. Normally, I should suppose, grammar will be the child's first lesson in Science, because language is his first great intellectual experience. As to the age when the study of grammar should *begin*, I am afraid I have not the necessary experience to decide, but I should say that the *essentials* of the course which I have sketched should have been mastered by the time at which a pupil has attained reasonable precision of speech, that is to say, normally, about the age of eleven or twelve. By that time he should understand what is meant by the several parts of speech, by subject, object, and complement, by transitive and intransitive verbs, by a phrase and a clause (and what are their chief varieties), by a relative pronoun and a conjunction. That, I think, is about all that matters. I need hardly say, I do not suggest that it shall all be given in one dose. Let the child begin with noun and verb, using the noun both as subject and object; then *turn* his sentences with the

verb in the passive voice, then add adjectives and adverbs and pronouns, until he is quite familiar with the five primary parts of speech. He will then be ready for phrases and simple clauses. It may be asked: Will grammar of this kind have any practical use? A great deal, I believe, depends on the teacher and the method used. The work should be as far as possible oral, this will make it lively and interesting; it should also be (as I have just suggested) constructive, and not merely analytical, that is to say the learner should be required to build up for himself sentences of different types, and later to amplify simple propositions by the addition of appropriate phrases and clauses. This will keep it in touch with realities, and prevent what is often the curse of grammar exercises, viz. the selection of difficult examples quite outside the learner's experience. E. g. constructive exercises on relative pronouns are particularly valuable: these pronouns are full of difficulty for children, and need constant practice, especially in the oblique cases, or where there is inversion (e. g. 'legends the source of which we do not know'); not to mention thriving weeds of jargon like 'as to which'. It is the experience, I have been told, of some elementary schools that constructive exercises of this kind teach children how to knit together the structure of their sentences, and so strengthen and clarify their sense of style.

May I utter a caution about the use of formal analysis, which is the prescribed exercise in this kind of grammar. It may easily be abused, it may easily become a dull and deadening routine. I suggest that it should only be resorted to when there is really something to elucidate, and only set as a written exercise to test whether a particular construction has been mastered. Many sentences are not suitable for analysis at all. The more idiomatic a sentence is, the less competent is analysis, because it is a purely logical instrument, to deal with it. E. g. No good can be got from analysing even simple sentences like

'Let's tell each other stories',

or, 'What's the good of doing that?'

The time will come when some children will proceed to a second language, and experience has shown that a course of Pure Grammar is a necessary preparation for such a study. Most teachers know that it is especially necessary when the pupil comes to deal with the subordinate clause, because the grammatical structure of such clauses is often such as to require considerable analytical power to understand it. But even children who never go beyond their own language will benefit by having gained this analytical power. They will, we may presume, not only study some of the great English prose classics (and they are not always easy) but will cultivate also the art of exact and

deliberate expression in writing. Such reading, and more particularly such writing, require a trained appreciation of the niceties of clause structure and connexion. Let me give one or two examples of quite common offences against the logical articulation of the complex sentence:

'One of the best books which has recently appeared' (wrong antecedent).

'He gave us a quotation which he did'nt say where it came from' (double subject, especially common in relative sentences).

'He was one of those men who couldn't express what he felt' (contamination: arising from confusion between two types of relative clause).

'As he didn't know the way, he said he had got lost' (wrong subordination).

It seems to me that the best means of correcting such mistakes is a careful grammatical analysis of the *structure* of the complex sentence. Let me say at once that I have no wish to exaggerate the enormity of loose grammar in young pupils; it is far more important that a child should write an easy and vigorous style than that he should laboriously compose merely grammatical English. But two good things are better than one, and we want both if possible.

So far we have been dealing with Pure Grammar, the Grammar of Function not of Form; it has only been English Grammar in the sense that we have been using English examples to illustrate universal principles. Apparently we have been analysing English sentences, really we have been analysing operations of thought. We must now complete our survey, since after all we are teaching English children, by a short study of English grammar as such, that is to say, of the grammar of a particular idiom. Of the three methods of indicating the relations of words in a sentence already mentioned—inflexion, order, and the use of a phrase—the two last will require little further attention since their significance is exhausted by that aspect of them already considered, namely, their function. It remains, therefore, to deal more particularly with inflexion; there still survive in English, we may remind ourselves, traces of our old inflected speech, and it will be well that our pupils shall complete their grammatical course by studying, so far as it is possible from English examples alone, something of what is meant by an inflected language. Now let us recognize frankly that the whole bulk of our inflected forms is small; more and more the genius of our idiom has run to expressing grammatical relations by means of word-order and phrase. Let us therefore observe two precautions: (i) to keep separate the grammatical

terms proper to inflected forms, and those which are descriptive of function, and (ii) let us scrupulously avoid applying the terminology of inflexion to words which are not inflected.

E. g. 'man' may be properly described as 'subject' or 'object' in a sentence, but not as nominative or accusative case; and conversely,

'If he should come' may be properly described as a conditional clause, but that does not make 'should come' a conditional mood.

If we are to have a conditional mood, why not an optative or a jussive mood? The inflexions that require study can be limited to possessive case and number for nouns, case, number, and gender for pronouns, and person, tense, mood, voice, and participles for verbs.

With gender in nouns we shall, I hope, have nothing to do. Tense is comparatively simple; the modern nine-tense scheme should be taught —i. e. the simple, imperfect, and perfect forms of the past, present, and future tenses. We have here an almost exact correspondence of form and function, but it will need pointing out that there are still survivals even in common speech of an older and simpler tense scheme; e. g. in the two sentences:

He crossed the street at 1.30.

He was knocked down as he crossed the street.

We have the past tense 'crossed' doing duty for two different modern tenses, the past simple and the past imperfect. In the sentence 'he crossed this street every day' we have still another use.

The term subjunctive mood should be reserved for those parts of the verb which are subjunctive in form; e. g.:

I fear lest he come.

O that 'twere possible, &c.

In the present tense they are of course easily recognizable by the absence of person endings.

It may be asked—

How much of this should be taught, and when?

I should reply (i) 'as much as the pupil can take', and (ii) 'when occasion arises'. For example, it may safely be said that when a pupil begins a more serious study of Shakespeare, some elementary instruction in the subjunctive and its uses becomes almost necessary; it abounds on every page.

I don't think it is any use attempting to dodge the subjunctive. In a recent school text-book on grammar I found the note: 'Whatever may have been the origin of "I'd" in the sentence, "I'd rather", it is now commonly accepted as standing for "I would rather".' This

kind of teaching is sure to be found out, because the child will sooner or later run against 'I had rather', written unmistakably in his Bible or in Shakespeare.

Of what importance is this kind of grammar to the child? Its importance seems to me to lie in the fact that the grammatical terms we are discussing are the appropriate tools or instruments for dealing with the facts of an inflected language, and that the use of the appropriate tool is always the best, and in the end the most economical. Apropos, let me read you a short passage from the memoirs of Baron Martin:

A witness was giving evidence as to certain conversations, but owing to the ambiguities of reported speech his meaning was almost unintelligible. After Counsel had failed to make any impression on him, the learned Baron took him in hand:

Now, he began, tell us exactly what was said.

Well, my lord, he told me that he had been keeping the pig—

No, no: he didn't say that; he spoke in the first person.

No, my lord, I was the first person that spoke.

I mean this, don't keep bringing in the third person.

There was no third person, my lord, only him and me.

But can't you give us his exact words?

Those were the very words he spoke, my lord.

Now look here, my good fellow (said his Lordship, warming), he didn't say he had been keeping the pig; didn't he say, 'I have been keeping the pig'?

I assure you, my lord, there was no mention of your Lordship at all. We are on two different stories, you and me.

Let us return to our point. There are, in particular, certain ambiguous forms in all inflected languages, the use of which in some sentences opens the door to misunderstanding; it seems to me that the natural way and the direct way of removing this danger is to ask the questions, what case? what mood? what part of the verb? is such and such a word. Let me give but one instance—the possible confusion between past participle and past tense. Here are some gleanings from a few pages of 'Julius Caesar':

'All pity choked with custom of fell deeds.'

'His glory not extenuated, nor his offences enforced.'

'Is it fit, the threefold world divided, he should stand . . .'

'His corporal motion governed by my spirit.'

'Omitted, all the voyage of their life
Is bound in shallows.'

These are all traps for the young reader. Would he not be warned

against a danger by a knowledge that the ambiguous words are participles? And is not such knowledge the obvious way of meeting it?

May I just give an instance of another kind? It is often said, and rightly, that a study of grammar will not teach correct English. We must, however, distinguish; a study of grammar will not, it is true, affect a child's natural and instinctive speech. The remedy for 'we was' is not grammar but constant practice in the use of standard English. There are, however, certain solecisms which make their appearance when children drop their natural speech and attempt to write in what they consider a literary style. One of these is so common that the illusion which gives rise to it almost deserves a special name. We might call it the 'fallacy of the literary nominative'. I am thinking of examples like 'between you and I', 'let you and I agree', 'he likes you better than I' (meaning me). There is much literary virtue in a nominative, but that is not the only case to suffer; it may be the accusative if that case has what I may call the true artificial ring, e. g. 'Whom do you think he was?' and even 'Whom was it supposed that he was?' The point to notice is that none of these mistakes are natural to speech; they are essentially sophisticated, the result of a conscious effort after style, and that being so, the appeal to grammar, to a scientific analysis of the fault, seems to be the right remedy.

May I say just a word about parsing? which is or was the established exercise in the grammar of inflected speech. English parsing ought to be abolished: there are few words in our language which are worth parsing in full, at least by schoolchildren. The proper exercise, and this only when there is something to elucidate, is to ask a particular question, What case is 'her' in this sentence? what mood is 'bring'? what part of the verb is 'enfolded'? and so on. Parsing like:

man: Nom. case, sing. no., masculine gend., &c.,

has no use at all; it is not science, but rigmarole.

One word in conclusion. I have dealt with Pure Grammar and English Grammar separately, but I do not in the least suggest that they should be kept in watertight compartments, or that one should be completed before the other is begun. As soon as the mere elements of Pure Grammar have been mastered, the grammar of English idiom may be introduced and will need to be introduced as occasion calls for it.

THE DISCUSSION AT THE CONFERENCE

The discussion was opened by Miss Brackenbury (Graystoke Place Day Training College) who began by declaring that she did not believe in teaching grammar to children under the age of sixteen and would in any case only devote a few weeks of school-life to it. The sentence, she continued, was the unit of language, and a sentence was a social product, the work of two minds, a speaker and a listener, of whom the listener was the more important. Further, a sentence, being a unit, could not be broken up; 'analysis', therefore, consisted in thinking of the sentence from the point of view first of the subject and then of the predicate. The subject itself was just a name (more often a set of words than a single word) which raised in the speaker's mind an idea like some idea he has had before, and which, pronounced in speech and uttered to others, served to them as a mark of what the speaker had in his mind. The essential part, the most difficult part, however, of the sentence was the verbal core of the predicate. The verb performed a double function; it was the assertive word and it characterized action. 'When you are doing as little as ever you can', Miss Brackenbury would ask her children, 'what are you doing?' They replied 'We are just being'. Being is a kind of action. This led on to the distinction between intransitive, where the action is confined to the doer, and transitive, where the action is such that it cannot be performed unless at least one, in many cases two, other persons or things are there besides. In this way, she claimed, it was possible to teach the elements of grammar without using any technical terms.

Professor Sonnenschein, who next spoke, made an energetic attack upon Professor Mawer's reference to the Report of the Joint-Committee on Grammatical Terminology. 'I have the greatest possible respect for Professor Jespersen,' he declared, 'whose personal acquaintance I have the honour of enjoying, but I really protest against the idea that Professor Jespersen, however competent a scholar of English he may be,—and he knows far more than ninety-nine out of a hundred Englishmen—is necessarily going to lay down the law or to be regarded as a superior authority to a Committee of about twenty-two persons representing eight different associations, who by no means looked at the matter purely from the point of view of ancient or modern languages, but who, on the contrary, took as their fundamental basis of discussion what I might call Indo-European

syntax, that is the common features that are shared by all languages. I believe it is that which the Government Committee had in mind when they spoke about "Pure Grammar" in their Report'. It was absurd, he added, to describe English as an uninflected language. In a sentence like 'If he had asked me I should have told him the facts', nine out of the twelve words were inflected, which is as high a proportion as you would find in any Latin sentence.

Rev. A. Darby attempted to unfold to the conference a new method of his own for the teaching of grammar; but was unable to finish his remarks within the allotted ten minutes.

Dr. P. B. Ballard said that before coming to the conference he had entertained strong suspicions that grammar was really a branch of psychology; and those suspicions were confirmed by what he had just heard. What was a sentence? Writers on the psychology of thinking had always suggested that when we were brooding, meditating, thinking, we were thinking in complete sentences. We did nothing of the kind. Our sentences were very incomplete. When we thought over a subject at all, our thought expressed itself not in sentences, but in unsystematized words, images, feelings. It was only when we wished to convey our thoughts to other people that we put them into sentences. The notion of a sentence was a very difficult thing to get into the mind of a child. A large number of head-masters of public elementary schools in the west of London had been tabling the mistakes made in composition by children from the age of about ten to fourteen or fifteen. Thirteen millions were examined. A grammatical error occurred once in every four hundred words, but the most frequent blunder was the misuse of the full-stop. The children did not know where to put it, and either omitted it or misplaced it. They did not know where the sentence ended. Who did? 'He came: he saw: he conquered.' Were these three sentences or one sentence? Ought we to punctuate the whole with commas, colons, or full-stops? There was no psychological reason why we should prefer one kind of pointing to the other two. Punctuation was largely a matter of fashion, and it took a long time to get the child to realize what the fashion was. Again, it was often said that grammatical mistakes were invariably due to ignorance of grammar. When an expression like 'One of the best books that has ever been written' occurred in the first nine editions of one of Mr. Hilaire Belloc's volumes, did it follow that the author was ignorant of the laws of grammar? Or again, when about two-thirds down page 169 of the *Report on the Teaching of English* you light upon the following sentence: 'Training in clear and correct speech and in reading aloud

are essential', you would be rash to assume without further consideration that the English Committee did not know grammar. Yet mistakes of this kind arose from precisely the same causes as most of those in the exercises of schoolchildren. They were due to the disturbance produced by the presence of intervening words. Finally, Dr. Ballard asserted, it had been shown over and over again that between ability in grammar and ability in composition there is no relation whatever.

Miss Philpot emphasized certain difficulties and dangers in the teaching of grammar. The children, in the first place, saw no need for it. When they were learning a foreign language they knew that they could not speak it or read it before they had acquired some knowledge of grammar. But they could speak English and understand it according to the level of their intelligence at the time; why then, they felt, should they be required to study English grammar? There was a further difficulty in the teacher himself, since his interest in grammar was so coloured by the influence of other languages and by that still more dangerous thing, his knowledge of the past history of his own tongue, that he was liable to forget that half the interest in grammar could not possibly exist for the child who lacked that knowledge. Most of those present, Miss Philpot thought, were glad to see a recognition in the English Report of the value of functional as opposed to formal grammar. The difficulty was, however, that teachers were on the horns of a dilemma; they wanted to initiate children into the science of language before they began French or Latin, while at the same time they were conscious that children of this age were not capable of an abstract interest in the functions and structure of language. The teacher, in consequence, had to fall back upon some fictitious interest, such as coloured chalks or those very intriguing sentences that Mr. Morgan gives in his Grammar. But if the teaching of Pure Grammar was difficult, the teaching of English Grammar was positively dangerous. It was full of pitfalls, and over and over again the conscientious teacher of English grammar must feel that he is teaching something of which he himself is not sure, something that is not necessarily true.

Miss Clark taught grammar to children of eleven or twelve because it was a help to the French mistress, the German mistress, and the Latin mistress. It saved these teachers much time and the children came on to foreign languages with very many difficulties cleared away. Not that she agreed with Miss Philpot for one moment that children disliked grammar. On the contrary, they always liked it—an extraordinary fact perhaps, but true.

Dr. McKerrow had found it very difficult, if not impossible, to bring home to Japanese the facts of the English language as they were presented, or misrepresented, in English grammar-books. He asked whether it were not the fact that several sorts of grammar were needed. The Report on Grammatical Terminology was admirable for its purpose, which was to find a terminology capable of being used in different classes of the European group of languages. It was, however, quite a different matter when it came to teaching English to children who are not necessarily, or even probably, going on to learn other languages. And yet another problem was presented by the teaching of foreigners, whose language was entirely different from one's own. We needed, therefore, something like three grammars at least.

Mr. A. Watson Bain professed himself in general agreement with Professor Mawer and Mr. Andrew, and in general disagreement with the views of his own teacher of Latin, Professor Sonnenschein. For himself, he thought that all the grammar that was absolutely necessary for British people could be set down on half a sheet of paper. He would even go farther than the first two speakers. He did not believe that there was such a thing as case in English at all. Instead of speaking about genitive, or dative, or accusative, or nominative, it is quite enough to speak of subject and object; and in the case of pronouns where there were inflected forms the phrase, indirect object, was convenient. A Frenchman never talked about genitive or dative, but only of *régime direct* and *régime indirect*. For the great majority of English children no grammatical teaching of any kind was necessary, but to the small percentage who would later take up a foreign language a little simple elementary grammar should be taught at about ten years of age. The fact that the Joint Committee on Grammatical Terminology had a number of distinguished people sitting upon it did not carry any weight with him. Equally distinguished Frenchmen some years ago put forth a report on French grammar, and recommended among other things that the past participle need no longer agree with the preceding direct object. The suggestion was entirely opposed to the genius of the French language, and no journalist or writer took the slightest notice of it. The French past participle still agreed with the preceding direct object. In any event, whether grammar was taught in small doses or large, he strongly deprecated the use of English literature, and especially English poetry, as a storehouse of pegs for grammatical teaching.

Mr. George Sampson spoke on behalf of the schools which, although

they had hardly been mentioned hitherto in the discussion, were the most important in the country, because they represented at once the great bulk of the population and the most needy bulk of the population. The position of grammar in the elementary schools was quite simple: in the ordinary sense, grammar should not be found there at all. What children needed to be taught in the elementary school was not English grammar but the English language. To attempt to teach them formal grammar was to thrust upon them a science for which they had no data. The elementary schoolchild began his education with his language in a state of disease, and it was the business of the teacher to purify and disinfect that language. Mr. Sampson illustrated what grammar-teaching used to mean in the elementary schools by reading, to the amusement of the conference, a specimen of the 'Grammatical Test Cards' for Standard 6, one of the questions being, 'Define clearly what is meant by the case of nouns'. He concluded by remarking that if elementary schoolchildren transferred to secondary schools found any difficulty in beginning Latin or French, it was because they knew so little of language, not because they knew no grammar. They had never been taught to observe the simple and obvious phenomena of their own language.

The conference was brought to an end with brief replies from Professor Mawer and Mr. Andrew.

29. Bibliographies of Swinburne, Morris, and Rossetti. By C. E. Vaughan. Price 1s.
30. Wordsworth's Patriotic Poems and their Significance To-day. By F. S. Boas, LL.D. Price 1s.
31. The Use of Comic Episodes in Tragedy. By W. H. Hadow. Price 1s.
32. On Concentration and Suggestion in Poetry. By Sir Sidney Colvin, D.Litt. Price 1s.
33. School Libraries. By J. H. Fowler. Price 1s.
34. Poetry and the Child. By J. Dover Wilson. Price 1s.
35. The Eighteenth Century. By W. P. Ker, LL.D. Price 1s.
36. Poetry in the Light of War. By C. F. E. Spurgeon. Price 1s.
37. English Papers in Examinations for Pupils of School Age in England and Wales. Price 1s.
38. War and English Poetry. By the Most Hon. the Marquess of Crewe, K.G. Price 1s.
39. The Reaction against Tennyson. By A. C. Bradley, Litt.D. Price 1s.
40. The Study of Poetry. By E. de Sélincourt, D.Litt. (Out of print.) Price 1s.
41. The Perspective of Biography. By Sir Sidney Lee. Price 1s.
42. Some Remarks on Translation and Translators. By J. S. Phillimore. Price 1s.
43. The Teaching of English in Schools. Price 1s.
44. Sir Henry Wotton, with some General Reflections on Style in English Poetry. By the Right Hon. H. H. Asquith. Price 1s.
45. The Greek Strain in English Literature. By John Burnet, F.B.A. Price 1s.
46. A Reference Library: English Language and Literature. Price 1s.
47. The Normality of Shakespeare illustrated in his Treatment of Love and Marriage. By C. H. Herford, Litt.D. Price 1s.
48. Don Quixote. Some War-time Reflections on its Character and Influence. By H. J. C. Grierson, LL.D. Price 1s.
49. A Note on the Teaching of 'English Language and Literature', with some Suggestions. By R. B. McKerrow, Litt.D. Price 1s.
50. The Light Reading of our Ancestors. By the Right Hon. Lord Ernle, M.V.O. Price 1s.
51. Sir Thomas Malory. By E. K. Chambers, C.B. Price 1s.
52. De Quincey as Literary Critic. By J. H. Fowler. Price 1s.
53. The Teaching of English in the Universities of England. By R. W. Chambers, D.Litt. With a Note in Comment by John Bailey. Price 1s.
54. The Continuity of Literature. By Edmund Gosse, C.B., LL.D. Price 1s.
55. Some Thoughts about Verse. By T. S. Omond. Price 1s.
56. The Problem of Grammar. Price 1s.

Members can obtain further copies of the *Bulletin* (price 6d.) on application to the Secretary.

Any member having copies to spare of Pamphlets Nos. 1, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 13, and 17 is requested to communicate with the Secretary.

Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association. Vol. I. Collected by A. C. Bradley. Clarendon Press. 3s. to members.

Contents:—English Place-names, by Henry Bradley; On the Present State of English Pronunciation, by Robert Bridges; Browning, by W. P. Ker; Blind Harry's 'Wallace', by George Neilson; Shakespeare and the Grand Style, by George Saintsbury; Some Suggestions about Bad Poetry, by Edith Sichel; Carlyle and his German Masters, by C. E. Vaughan.

Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association. Vol. II. Collected by Dr. Beeching. Clarendon Press. 3s. to members.

Contents:—The Particle *ing* in Place-Names, by H. Alexander; On the Nature of the Grand Style, by John Bailey; Richardson's Novels and their Influences, by F. S. Boas; Jane Austen, by A. C. Bradley; Description in Poetry, by A. Clutton-Brock; The Literary Play, by C. E. Montague; A Yorkshire Folk-Play and its Analogues, by F. Moorman.

Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association. Vol. III. Collected by W. P. Ker. Clarendon Press. 3s. to members.

Contents:—What English Poetry may still learn from Greek, by Gilbert Murray; Some Childish Things, by A. A. Jack; *A Lover's Complaint*, by J. W. Mackail; Arnold and Homer, by T. S. Omond; Keats's Epithets, by David Watson Rannie; Dante and the Grand Style, by George Saintsbury; Blake's Religious Lyrics, by H. C. Beeching.

Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association. Vol. IV. Collected by C. H. Herford. Clarendon Press. 3s. to members.

Contents:—A Note on Dramatic Criticism, by J. E. Spingarn; English Prose Numbers, by O. Elton; Some Unconsidered Elements in English Place-names, by A. Mawer; Platonism in Shelley, by L. Winstanley; Defoe's *True-born Englishman*, by A. C. Guthkelch; The Plays of Mr. John Galsworthy, by A. R. Skemp; Dramatic Technique in Marlowe, by G. P. Baker.

Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association. Vol. V. Collected by Oliver Elton. Clarendon Press. 3s. to members.

Contents:—Rhythm in English Verse, Prose, and Speech, by D. S. MacColl; The Novels of Mark Rutherford, by A. E. Taylor; English Place-names and Teutonic Sagas, by F. W. Moorman; Shelley's *Triumph of Life*, by F. Melian Stawell; Emily Brontë, by J. C. Smith; Translation from Old into Modern English, by A. Blyth Webster.

Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association. Vol. VI. Collected by A. C. Bradley. Clarendon Press. 3s. 6d. to members.

Contents:—The 'Cædmonian' Genesis, by Henry Bradley; The Humanist Ideal, by W. P. Ker; Trollope Revisited, by George Saintsbury; On Playing the Sedulous Ape, by George Sampson; Conrad, by F. Melian Stawell; South-Eastern and South-East Midland Dialects, by H. C. Wyld.

Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association. Vol. VII. Collected by John Bailey. Clarendon Press. 3s. 6d. to members.

Contents:—Rhyme in English Poetry, by B. de Sélincourt; Words and Music in Song, by A. H. Fox Strangways; Thomas Parnell; or, What was wrong with the Eighteenth Century, by A. H. Cruickshank; A Contemporary Light upon John Donne, by John Sampson; A Bundle of Ballads, by Geo. Neilson; The 1604 Text of Marlowe's 'Doctor Faustus', by Percy Simpson.

Essays and Studies by Members of the English Association. Vol. VIII. Collected by G. C. Moore Smith. Clarendon Press. 3s. 6d. to members.

Contents:—Tragedy, by J. S. Smart; The Felon Sew, by George H. Cowling; On the Meanings of Certain Terms in the Anglo-Saxon Charters, by G. B. Grundy; Mysticism in English Poetry, by A. Hamilton Thompson; Romanticism in the Modern World, by C. H. Herford; Hazlitt, by W. P. Ker; English Grammar and Grammars, by R. B. McKerrow.

Poems of To-day. An Anthology. Published for the English Association by Sidgwick & Jackson, Ltd. Price (stiff paper) 2s.; (cloth) with biographical notes, 3s. 6d.

Poems of To-day. An Anthology. 2nd Series. Published for the English Association by Sidgwick & Jackson, Ltd. Price (stiff paper) 2s.; (cloth) with biographical notes, 3s. 6d.

The Essentials of English Teaching. Published for the English Association by Longmans, Green & Co. Price 6d. to members; postage 1d.

The Year's Work in English Studies, 1919–20. Vol. I. Edited by Sir Sidney Lee. Clarendon Press. 3s. 6d. to members.

The Year's Work in English Studies, 1920–21. Vol. II. Edited by Sir Sidney Lee and Dr. F. S. Boas. Clarendon Press. 3s. 6d. to members.

PRINTED IN ENGLAND AT THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

Not access. LaE.Gr
P962S
Author
Title The problem of grammar.
DATE. NAME OF BORROWER.
University of Toronto
Library
DO NOT
REMOVE
THE
CARD
FROM
THIS
POCKET
Acme Library Card Pocket
LOWE-MARTIN CO. LIMITED

UTL AT DOWNSVIEW
D RANGE BAY SHLF POS ITEM C
39 12 25 08 01 018 5